CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

MINNESOTA

NoChild
LeftBehind

PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies–State, local, and Federal–is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- o   Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- o   Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- o   Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o   Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- o   Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- o   Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- o   Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- o   Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- o   Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- o   Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- o   Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.

3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

  _X_ Part I, 2007-08   ___Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Minnesota Dept of Ed

Address:
1500 Highway 36 W
Roseville MN

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Greg Marcus

Telephone: 651-582-8454

Fax: 651-582-8727

e-mail: greg.marcus@state.mn.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Jessie Montano

_____   _Wednesday, April 1, 2009, 3:04:42 PM_

   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08

NoChild
LeftBehind

PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Subject specific content standards are on a schedule to be revised every 9 years. Below are the years in which the most recent revision occurred or will be occurring. 2006-07 -Mathematics standards revised 2008-09 -Science standards will be revised 2009-10 -Language Arts standards will be revised

---

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All assessments are on schedule to be revised to match the standards. The revisions stated in 1.1.1 will be assessed using the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series III (MCA-III) for general education students and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) for the most significant cognitively disabled students (alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards). Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards are being considered but timeline for implementation has not yet been determined. All items are created and field tested at least one year before they are operational.

Mathematics 2007-08 -Mathematics test specifications written to revised standards 2008-09 -Mathematics items field tested 2010-11 - Mathematics operational for grades 3-8 2013-14 -Mathematics operational for grade 11

Language Arts 2009-10 -MCA-III Test Specs and Item Development 2010-11 -MCA-III Items Field Tested 2011-12 -MCA III Operational

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

> All assessments match the standards. The Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series II (MCA-II) for general education students and the Minnesota Test of Academic Skills (MTAS) for the most significant cognitively disabled students (alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards). Alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards are being considered but timeline for implementation has not yet been determined. All items are created and field tested at least one year before they are operational. 2009-10 Test Specs 2010-11 Field Test 2011-12 Operational

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	426,640	423,008	99.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,283	9,003	97.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,753	25,504	99.0
Black, non-Hispanic	38,586	37,966	98.4
Hispanic	24,984	24,676	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	328,034	325,859	99.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	56,704	55,919	98.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,014	30,686	98.9
Economically disadvantaged students	137,874	136,391	98.9
Migratory students	888	867	97.6
Male	218,070	216,179	99.1
Female	208,570	206,829	99.2
Comments: 1.2.1 is only counting AYP schools. 1.2.2 is counting all schools. General assessment data counts only AYP accountability, while specific CWD or migrant sections count students in all schools.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,987	60.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,978	29.3
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		

Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,963	10.3
Total	57,928	
Comments: 0		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	427,836	425,304	99.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,357	9,112	97.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,727	25,572	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	39,052	38,604	98.9
Hispanic	25,383	25,050	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	328,317	326,966	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	57,248	56,625	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32,042	31,640	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	139,907	138,676	99.1
Migratory students	925	904	97.7
Male	218,473	217,139	99.4
Female	209,363	208,165	99.4
Comments: 1.2.3 is only counting AYP schools. 1.2.4 is counting all schools. General assessment data counts only AYP accountability, while specific CWD or migrant sections count students in all schools.			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	49,448	84.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,207	5.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,097	10.4
Total	58,752	
Comments: 1		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	182,149	181,347	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,633	3,557	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	10,829	10,792	99.7
Black, non-Hispanic	15,230	15,063	98.9
Hispanic	9,490	9,417	99.2
White, non-Hispanic	142,764	142,365	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,652	22,495	99.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,351	11,281	99.4
Economically disadvantaged students	54,956	54,558	99.3
Migratory students	270	267	98.9
Male	93,158	92,718	99.5
Female	88,991	88,629	99.6
Comments: 1.2.5 is only counting AYP schools. 1.2.6 is counting all schools. General assessment data counts only AYP accountability, while specific CWD or migrant sections count students in all schools.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	18,397	78.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,730	11.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,439	10.3
Total	23,566	
Comments: 1		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,837	46,724	79.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,278	812	63.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,631	2,572	70.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,741	3,139	54.7
Hispanic	4,182	2,381	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,005	37,820	85.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,057	4,560	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,804	2,984	51.4
Economically disadvantaged students	21,049	13,574	64.5
Migratory students	131	68	51.9
Male	30,077	23,945	79.6
Female	28,760	22,779	79.2
Comments: federal actions and the economy have impacted numbers.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,663	46,542	79.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,276	853	66.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,607	2,319	64.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,698	3,194	56.1
Hispanic	4,134	2,203	53.3
White, non-Hispanic	43,948	37,973	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,981	4,217	52.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,703	2,453	43.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,930	13,320	63.6
Migratory students	131	51	38.9
Male	29,976	22,906	76.4
Female	28,687	23,636	82.4
Comments: federal actions and the economy have impacted numbers.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,445	40,803	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,326	663	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,562	2,308	64.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,451	2,168	39.8
Hispanic	3,813	1,673	43.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,293	33,991	76.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,315	3,706	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,120	1,971	38.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,335	10,486	51.6
Migratory students	129	52	40.3
Male	29,617	20,912	70.6
Female	28,828	19,891	69.0
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,233	42,272	72.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,321	712	53.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,526	2,172	61.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,408	2,421	44.8
Hispanic	3,756	1,763	46.9
White, non-Hispanic	44,222	35,204	79.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,203	3,584	43.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,001	1,806	36.1
Economically disadvantaged students	20,206	11,067	54.8
Migratory students	128	51	39.8
Male	29,497	20,388	69.1
Female	28,736	21,884	76.2
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,805	37,953	64.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,295	528	40.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,651	2,156	59.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,357	1,810	33.8
Hispanic	3,825	1,510	39.5
White, non-Hispanic	44,677	31,949	71.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,288	3,013	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,765	1,498	31.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20,037	8,919	44.5
Migratory students	132	42	31.8
Male	30,031	19,502	64.9
Female	28,774	18,451	64.1
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,629	43,282	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,301	713	54.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,625	2,269	62.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,313	2,574	48.4
Hispanic	3,780	1,898	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	44,610	35,828	80.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,161	3,388	41.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,663	1,680	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	19,929	11,143	55.9
Migratory students	132	51	38.6
Male	29,912	21,271	71.1
Female	28,717	22,011	76.6
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,738	23,323	39.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,299	268	20.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,662	983	26.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,349	720	13.5
Hispanic	3,803	638	16.8
White, non-Hispanic	44,576	20,701	46.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,408	2,116	25.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,740	309	6.5
Economically disadvantaged students	19,948	4,258	21.3
Migratory students	135	11	8.1
Male	30,003	12,905	43.0
Female	28,735	10,418	36.3
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,787	37,106	63.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,282	465	36.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,623	2,180	60.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,247	1,698	32.4
Hispanic	3,424	1,225	35.8
White, non-Hispanic	45,211	31,538	69.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,623	2,349	30.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,200	1,215	28.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,457	8,359	43.0
Migratory students	115	30	26.1
Male	29,979	18,956	63.2
Female	28,808	18,150	63.0
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	58,662	41,128	70.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,281	633	49.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,611	2,071	57.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,214	2,369	45.4
Hispanic	3,405	1,560	45.8
White, non-Hispanic	45,151	34,495	76.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,561	2,613	34.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,116	1,181	28.7
Economically disadvantaged students	19,380	9,915	51.2
Migratory students	114	42	36.8
Male	29,882	19,847	66.4
Female	28,780	21,281	73.9
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,590	36,399	60.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,280	434	33.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,543	1,950	55.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,273	1,399	26.5
Hispanic	3,351	1,072	32.0
White, non-Hispanic	47,143	31,544	66.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,667	1,973	25.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,816	856	22.4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,181	7,170	37.4
Migratory students	101	33	32.7
Male	30,998	18,574	59.9
Female	29,592	17,825	60.2
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	60,548	39,514	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,285	575	44.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,543	1,912	54.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,241	2,042	39.0
Hispanic	3,331	1,318	39.6
White, non-Hispanic	47,148	33,667	71.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,672	2,269	29.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,750	855	22.8
Economically disadvantaged students	19,156	8,688	45.4
Migratory students	104	27	26.0
Male	30,975	18,819	60.8
Female	29,573	20,695	70.0
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,438	35,087	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,285	379	29.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,640	1,897	52.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,225	1,263	24.2
Hispanic	3,228	917	28.4
White, non-Hispanic	48,060	30,631	63.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,527	1,644	21.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,667	670	18.3
Economically disadvantaged students	18,824	6,605	35.1
Migratory students	146	32	21.9
Male	31,381	17,976	57.3
Female	30,057	17,111	56.9
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,427	40,866	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,288	558	43.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,626	1,988	54.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,201	1,972	37.9
Hispanic	3,205	1,365	42.6
White, non-Hispanic	48,107	34,983	72.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,594	2,232	29.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,580	804	22.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,793	8,650	46.0
Migratory students	146	42	28.8
Male	31,393	19,274	61.4
Female	30,034	21,592	71.9
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	61,253	23,756	38.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,255	209	16.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,637	977	26.9
Black, non-Hispanic	5,196	658	12.7
Hispanic	3,217	455	14.1
White, non-Hispanic	47,879	21,439	44.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,697	1,374	17.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,640	176	4.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,687	3,701	19.8
Migratory students	148	16	10.8
Male	31,313	12,767	40.8
Female	29,940	10,989	36.7
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,311	21,363	34.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,069	124	11.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,546	1,046	29.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4,771	376	7.9
Hispanic	2,385	297	12.5
White, non-Hispanic	50,540	19,520	38.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,399	573	9.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,547	97	3.8
Economically disadvantaged students	15,430	2,376	15.4
Migratory students	67	N<10	
Male	31,880	11,410	35.8
Female	30,431	9,953	32.7
Comments: This population has been unstable due to government and economic activities.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	64,795	46,496	71.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,178	580	49.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,634	2,127	58.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,448	2,061	37.8
Hispanic	2,826	1,221	43.2
White, non-Hispanic	51,709	40,507	78.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,125	2,313	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,539	865	24.4
Economically disadvantaged students	17,852	8,843	49.5
Migratory students	103	37	35.9
Male	32,949	22,750	69.0
Female	31,846	23,746	74.6
Comments: This population has been unstable due to economic and government activities			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	62,815	27,111	43.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,047	218	20.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,612	1,168	32.3
Black, non-Hispanic	4,849	694	14.3
Hispanic	2,594	470	18.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,586	24,543	48.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,492	1,205	18.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,067	215	7.0
Economically disadvantaged students	16,509	3,868	23.4
Migratory students	96	11	11.5
Male	32,082	14,514	45.2
Female	30,733	12,597	41.0
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,916	983	51.3
Districts	502	210	41.8
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	828	457	55.2
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	247	85	34.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	581	372	64.0
Comments: Minnesota's proportion of students needing to be proficient (in order for schools and districts to make AYP) increased.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group
32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
419	172	41.1
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))[1]
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

[1] The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	9
Extension of the school year or school day	6
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	8
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	11
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There were no "other major restructuring of the school governance options" implemented for 2007-08.

For 2007-08 only two schools implemented Restructuring plans. This was for "Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal).

Lucy Laney (Minneapolis Public Schools) was closed and reopened with a new principal and administrative team. It was fresh-started with over 50% of the students being new to the school and 75% of the staff being new. They became a Marzano school; he consulted weekly with the management team of the school.

Nellie Stone (Minneapolis Public Schools) was fresh-started with over 50% of the students being new to the school and 75% of the staff being new. They reopened with a new principal and administrative team. They used the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) model.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that** list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

[2] The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2007-08 was the second year of implementation in which the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), Division of School Improvement changed its AYP support model to one of a regionally based Statewide System of Support (SSOS). This change capitalizes on a regional delivery model that provides technical assistance to Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and schools as required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The development of this model was based on research of best practices from other states as well as an extensive review of the legislation, regulations and guidance to ensure compliance. This change in service delivery provides a model of intentional, intensive and sustained SSOS for AYP schools and districts and builds capacity of districts throughout the state. This model ensures consistency in technical assistance and allows MDE, AYP coordinators, regional education service cooperatives, districts and schools to network while minimizing travel issues. AYP coordinators hired throughout the regions to provide technical assistance are typically experts in school improvement, distinguished educators and/or administrators. Teams of AYP coordinators are located at the regional service cooperatives across the state in the cities of Fergus Falls, Mankato, Marshall, Mountain Iron, Rochester, St. Cloud and Thief River Falls, St. Anthony and the districts of Minneapolis and St. Paul. The technical assistance takes the form of high quality professional development, ongoing evaluation to inform continuous improvement, ongoing technical assistance and other administrative services as needed.

For school year 2007-08, the AYP Coordinator's first priority was on-site consultation and professional development for schools and districts in corrective action and schools in stages of restructuring. The second priority, as outlined in the USDE Guidance, was working with districts In Need of Improvement. AYP Coordinators met with and had ongoing coordination with district improvement teams. A central focus was the development or updates of district improvement plans. The AYP Coordinators developed a calendar of professional development offerings/trainings/modules with a timeline for provision for their region. They provided professional development services both at districts/schools and at the regional service cooperative centers. All professional development opportunities were designed as a result of the AYP districts' needs assessments as mandated in the MDE school/district improvements plan. The regional service delivery model was also purposeful to increase district capacity to lead and provide structure to ensure that their schools were effective in increasing student achievement, especially for identified student groups.

All AYP improvement plans for districts were submitted by the 90 day deadline as outlined under Title I Part A (November 30, 2007). An improvement plan addendum was provided for districts in Corrective Action. A district must choose at least one Corrective Action as defined under Section 1116 of Title I Part A. With the new addendum, a district plan can identify the Corrective Action(s) they have chosen and provide a narrative and action plan on how they will address areas needing improvement. The MDE AYP Team reviewed 100 plans submitted by AYP districts from across the state including 18 districts in Corrective Action.

AYP regional Coordinators deliver trainings in the areas of tailored data retreats, classroom walkthrough trainings, quality indicator assessment, use of formative assessment trainings, and leadership networking of teachers (in such areas as working with children with special needs, students of poverty, ELL, etc.). The outcomes of the trainings were intended to close the gap of professional development needed by districts/schools not making AYP. Institutions of higher learning are also networking with regional service cooperatives on some of these initiatives as well. All of these components fit together in support of the SSOS.

To lend additional support to the initiatives involved with district improvement plan development, MDE hired a consultant to work cross divisionally with the Federal Programs Division, School Improvement Division, and the regional AYP Coordinators to further enhance the provision of trainings to LEAs with the "Comprehensive Needs Assessment" processes.

A member of the MDE School Improvement Division staff, with expertise in assessment, data analysis, and goal setting, has been assigned full-time to facilitate technical assistance to the regional service cooperatives as well as individual districts throughout the state. The School Improvement Division is also responsible for all statewide professional development and works closely with the regional AYP Coordinators in providing professional development as needed.

All AYP Coordinators submitted monthly work reports to MDE indicating hours involved in on-site consultation and professional development activities for districts in Need of Improvement or Corrective Action. The reports include participation in the needs assessment process, goal setting, job-embedded professional development, data retreats, and other technical assistance specific to the request of the school/district.

Quarterly AYP Coordinator Meetings -AYP Coordinators from across all regions of the state met at least quarterly to discuss their work with districts in Corrective Action and In Need of Improvement. The spring AYP Coordinator was meeting was specifically devoted to AYP Coordinators working with these districts. Power Points and presentation materials were developed and discussed. Resources were provided.

All MDE provided training modules go through an evaluation and refinement phase on a regular basis to ensure participants are receiving the most current information and assistance. As a result of participant feedback, follow-up modules have been developed to deepen participant understanding and to build internal leadership capacity in the school improvement efforts of a school or district.

Fiscal Services Support -the MDE AYP Team supervisor and financial specialist assigned to coordinate the 1003(a) funds were in regular

contact with regional service cooperative assigned staff to assure that funds were appropriately expended according to NCLB guidelines.

Accountability Forums -The Minnesota Department of Education Accountability Forums are a statewide collaborative effort to improve student achievement and to ensure there is "one voice carrying one message". The strategy with the development of the Accountability Forums were to provide consistent communication about AYP, transparency in policies, procedures and implementation, and technical assistance to districts on implementing polices and managing procedures. Accountability Forums were held at least quarterly and in locations across the state including the metro area. Monthly WebEx's were also provided along with any other email or phone technical support as needed. School Improvement, NCLB, IT, Special Education and School Choice divisions within the MDE collaborated with the regional service cooperatives and the regional information management centers in the design and presentation of the forums. All district
leadership team members were present and participated in these forums. Forum topics included:

- Data in the MN Automated Reporting Student System Web Editing System
- Data in TEST Web Editing System

-Eligibility and applying for a special education one percent waiver
-Assessment administration procedures
-Interpretation assessment, AYP, and Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives data
-AYP calculation review and appeals requests
-Writing a school and district improvement plan
-Implementing a school and district improvement

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	18
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	5	0
Schools	27	3
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/04/08

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
    - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
    - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
    - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	57,605	56,630
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	19,669	18,427
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	34.1	32.5
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	20,362	19,915
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	35.3	35.2
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	1,191	
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	445
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	2
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	358
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in *"Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)* If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	**Description of "Other Strategies"** This response is limited to 500 characters.	**Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status**	**Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status**	**Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy** (See response options in *"Column 6 Response Options Box"* below)	**Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"** This response is limited to 500 characters.
1	NA	107	1	22	C	NA
2	NA	107	1	22	C	NA
3	NA	107	1	22	C	NA
4	NA	107	1	22	C	NA
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development

Providing customized technical assistance and/or high quality professional development is a strategy of both the regional service cooperatives and the MN Department of Education (MDE). Technical Assistance and professional development is coordinated between the service cooperatives and MDE and based on the needs of schools and districts In Need of Improvement. The MDE School Improvement Division staff provides standards-based and data-driven professional development to schools with technical assistance that is linked to increasing student learning through effective teaching practices. Customized assistance for schools and districts in need of improvement is offered through these support topics: Data-Driven Decision Making, Formative Assessment, Professional Learning Communities, Teacher Leadership, Teacher Observation, Coaching, Mentoring, and Content requests.

The format of customized support includes conference, workshop/in-service, direct support to district, school or team. Preplanning for contextualized support includes asking the school three questions: What are the goals/outcomes you want to achieve as a result of this technical assistance? What are the participants' levels of knowledge about this support topic? What are the major areas of concern regarding this support topic? The purpose of the support is to build capacity in implementing evidence-based practices.

The MDE School Improvement Division supports the continuous improvement efforts of Minnesota's schools and districts through its high quality professional development workshops scheduled in every region in the state. The Professional Learning Community workshops are three full-day training selections that include Essential Skills for Effective Teamwork, Facilitation Strategies for Improved Student Learning, and Using Data and Protocols. The two full-day Teacher Leadership workshops emphasize Essential Skills for Teacher Leaders and Supporting Teacher Effectiveness. Classroom Formative Assessment is a two-day workshop that focuses on the collaboration between the teacher and student and suggests a framework for helping students learn how to self-assess their progress toward well-defined learning goals. Practice constructing learning goals and learning progressions for the classroom as well as identifying formative assessments aligned to learning goals is a major emphasis in day two of the workshop.

AYP regional Coordinators deliver technical assistance and high quality professional development in the areas of tailored data retreats, classroom walkthrough trainings, quality indicator assessment, use of formative assessment trainings, and leadership networking of teachers (in such areas as working with children with special needs, students of poverty, ELL, etc.). The outcomes of the professional development areas were intended to close the gap of professional development needed by districts/schools not making AYP. Institutions of higher learning are also networking with regional service cooperatives on some of these initiatives as well. All of these components fit together in support of the SSOS when coupled with support of MDE as well.

Utilize research-based strategies or practices

In accordance with NCLB, technical assistance and high quality professional development provided by MDE and the service cooperatives must be research-based. Simply working harder, adding on test preparation activities, or increasing the number of different teaching strategies is not adequate to prepare students to meet high standards. Research-based practices include using multiple sources of disaggregated student performance data, including state and local assessments, analysis of student work, and teacher observation to determine the learning needs for students as well as teachers.

By establishing professional learning communities, (job-embedded professional development), educators deepen content knowledge and pedagogy to continually improve practice. Teachers who spend more time collectively studying teaching practices are more effective overall at developing higher-order thinking skills and meeting the needs of diverse learners. Coordinated and aligned curriculum and assessment efforts generated through the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum have informed schools about their work.

Frequent monitoring of a manageable number of SMART improvement goals by teachers and teacher teams, administrators, and students guides the improvement focus. Using formative assessments to develop lessons that support differentiated learning informs teachers as well as students about identified learning needs. Making decisions from evidence of student learning is the best practice approach for school improvement. Coaching provides follow-up implementation support; without it, few new strategies are implemented and sustained. Schools receiving technical assistance used a combination of these strategies to impact targeted student growth and achievement.

Black and Willam (2007); Danielson, C. (2007); Du Four, R., Eaker, R.& Many, T. (2006); Fullan, M. (2007); Hargreaves, A. (2008); Marzano, R.J. (2007); National Staff Development Council; Schmoker, M. (2006); York-Barr, J.(2004);

Create partnerships among the SEA, LEA, and other entities

MDE, through the regional service delivery model, provides a school or a district that is identified for improvement with extensive support and technical assistance in designing and implementing a plan to improve student achievement. MDE implemented a regional technical assistance framework to better assist the district with their improvement responsibilities. This structure allows the School Improvement Division to develop support teams in a way that is efficient and sustainable. Furthermore, the technical assistance

framework ensures a consistent system of support for schools and districts, in accordance with federal expectations. Improvement plans drive the goals, policies, procedures, professional development, and teaching and learning needs at the school.

Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team The regional education service delivery model ensures that schools In Need of Improvement have a support team of skillful and experienced individuals charged with assisting their districts or schools with effective and helpful assistance to increase the opportunities for all students to meet the state's academic content and achievement standards. Teams includes some or all of the following: highly qualified or distinguished teachers and principals, pupil services personnel, parents, representatives of higher education, regional education service centers, and outside consultants.

Technical assistance and professional development areas that are especially beneficial for school support and district improvement teams include the data retreats, Quality Indicators (assessment tool developed for AYP schools) and onsite consultation for teams provided by regional AYP Coordinators.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %
Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: Question 1.4.8.5.2 (Get MS Excel Viewer)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) schools in corrective action or pre-restructuring (including charter schools) and corrective action districts with a student population of 1000 or less were eligible for School Improvement Grants under the approved application submitted to the US Department of Education. The grants were intended to leverage change through high-quality professional development and increased achievement in the area(s) of reading and/or mathematics.

Currently 5 schools/districts received $100,000 per year, renewable each year for up to two additional years providing that the applicant remains a Title 1 school and is identified in the corrective action or pre-restructuring stage of AYP. Future appropriations are further based on successful and timely progress of the grant and the continued availability of funds. Funding for a third year is dependent on the grant recipient's successful and timely implementation of their year 1 and year 2 work plans and meeting student achievement goals. Presently, 14 new additional applicants are being reviewed for funding in Round Two of the School Improvement Grant process.

All awardees must analyze reading and/or mathematics data in order to ensure there is direct alignment with state standards and assessments. SMART goals need to be established to improve student achievement in reading and/or mathematics. An internal professional development content specialist must be hired to provide high quality professional development activities aligned with SMART goals, establish professional learning communities for job-embedded learning, provide coaching and mentoring in reading and/or mathematics content, standards, instructional strategies and assessments, and incorporate formative assessments into everyday teaching practices.

Grant awardees will strengthen the current relationship between the regional service education cooperative [providing technical assistance under 1003(a)] and the school, district or charter school to support the intended outcomes of the work plan. All awardees are expected to describe how the site will document the evidence of successful professional development applied to the classroom and the effects on improving student achievement. Evaluation design must include: the type of data to be collected and analyzed; evidence demonstrating increased teacher effectiveness; evidence demonstrating improved student achievement; a plan for monitoring and reviewing grant goals, outcomes, and activities to provide accountability information for each funded year of the grant project.

Shortly after the Round 1 grants were awarded, a required full-day orientation that included the PD content hire(s), administration, and regional and/or technical assistant partners was scheduled at the Minnesota Department of Education. The purposes of the orientation were to provide opportunity to review and understand expectations, assurances and funding obligations in the School Improvement Grant and discuss the high quality professional development focus Additional training in professional learning communities as models of continuous improvement to advance PLC work, increase teacher effectiveness and promote student achievement was provided in the full-day training.

A National Staff Development Council framework for improving student achievement through staff development was included in the training materials. Specifically, these 5 steps were outlined: 1. Analyze student performance data and identify student learning needs; 2. Identify targets for educator learning and development; 3. Identify results-based staff development interventions aligned with target areas; 4. Design and implement staff development interventions and evaluation; 5. Provide ongoing support for learning and implementation of new knowledge, skills, and processes. Understanding this process, the content for learning, and the context was emphasized as well as the role of leadership to support the work of the grant.

Suggested tools to support the professional development specialist were distributed as well as a manual to clarify grant obligations. A particular training goal has included connecting principal leadership responsibilities and student achievement. To this end, the research and training included the importance of leadership establishing clear goals and keeping those goals in the forefront of the school's attention. The compelling why for a goal emphasis centered around two tenets: to identify the desired outcome in student achievement and to focus professional development efforts.

In making the connections to drive collective action, principals were trained to carry a big picture view and believe in PLCs as a professional learning model fundamental to school action and improvement. Dialogue included ways to support and encourage rigor

and identify high performance team traits.

Specific support for professional development content specialists has included follow up technical assistance from MDE by facilitating requests for formative assessment training, and connecting leaders with the MDE math specialist for specific learning needs and intervention strategies.

The MDE Education Specialist has offered phone and email assistance regarding topics about change, organizational planning, coaching, establishing learning priorities, and building capacity at the site for math and reading instructional leadership. Professional Development Specialists hired through the grant process complete monthly logs which detail activities, successes, and challenges. The MDE specialist follows up with each log to learn what support is needed and celebrate successes. A principal is invited to these conversations as well as any other personnel selected by the site. In January a formative evaluation initiated by MDE for Round 1 schools will be completed to review quantitative and qualitative date. Additionally, this will be helpful to understand what kinds of technical assistance continues to be needed.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Accountability Forums -The Minnesota Department of Education Accountability Forums are a statewide collaborative effort to improve student achievement and to ensure there is "one voice carrying one message". The strategy with the development of the Accountability Forums were to provide consistent communication about AYP, transparency in policies, procedures and implementation, and technical assistance to districts on implementing polices and managing procedures. Accountability Forums were held at least quarterly and in locations across the state including the metro area. Monthly WebEx's were also provided along with any other email or phone technical support as needed. School Improvement, NCLB, IT, Special Education and School Choice divisions within the MDE collaborated with the regional service cooperatives and the regional information management centers in the design and presentation of the forums. All district leadership team members were present and participated in these forums. Forum topics included:

-Data in the MN Automated Reporting Student System Web Editing System
-Data in TEST Web Editing System

-Eligibility and applying for a special education one percent waiver
-Assessment administration procedures
-Interpretation assessment, AYP, and Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives data
-AYP calculation review and appeals requests
-Writing a school and district improvement plan
-Implementing a school and district improvement plan
-Leveraging information in Educator Portal

Stage Zero (On-Watch) workshops -these were for schools and districts receiving Title I funds and had one year of Not Making AYP. MDE provided workshops across the state (213 schools and districts were Stage Zero). The workshop focused on data validity, data analysis tools, stages of AYP, requirements of schools and districts in various stages of AYP, Title I budget/setaside requirements, improvement plan requirements and professional development opportunities.

For example, School Choice requirements (for stage 1 AYP schools) were discussed which included parent notification letters prior to school; 20 percent setaside for School Choice transportation options; the 10 percent building setaside for professional development; and developing a school improvement plan. Schools were encouraged to work with their Title I LEA director on planning building budgets for next year; think about support team requirements; and begin work on data analysis which emphasized the academic achievement of identified student groups.

District In Need of Improvement requirements (for stage 1 AYP districts) were discussed which included notifying parents prior to school; 10 percent district setaside for professional development; developing a district improvement plan; flexing limited to 30 percent; and district not being able to serve as an SES provider. Districts were encouraged to work with their Title I LEA director on planning building budgets for next year; think about district level composition of teams; begin work on data analysis which emphasized the academic achievement of identified student groups; and what capacity issues need strengthening to serve their schools, especially those In Need of Improvement.

There are initiatives through the School Improvement Division which also provide support for schools and districts In Need of Improvement. The mission of the School Improvement Division is to assist educators to improve student achievement by providing professional development and program support. The division supports continuous improvement efforts through professional development, Math and Science Teacher Academies (MSTA), Q Comp, technology in the schools (Title II D), and the statewide system of support for schools and districts not meeting AYP. The School Improvement staff provides standards-based and data-driven professional development that is linked to increasing student learning through effective teaching practices. Professional development sessions include Teacher Observation, Teacher leadership, Professional learning Communities and Formative Assessment.

An example of a professional development initiative was the Minnesota Department of Education (through School Improvement division) establishing nine Math and Science Teacher Academies to give extra training to teachers last summer, with the expectation that those who participated would become trainers in their regions. The focus was helping teachers implement state subject standards, use different instruction techniques and improve their ability to assess student learning needs.

The academies are being paid for with a $1.5 million per year state appropriation and a $500,000 National Governors Association grant. Up to 900 teachers are to receive the training. The nine regional centers are in Fergus Falls, Mankato, Marshall, Mountain Iron, Plymouth, Rochester, St. Cloud, Staples and Thief River Falls.

Quality Compensation for Teachers (Q Comp) was proposed by Governor Tim Pawlenty and was enacted by the Minnesota Legislature

in July 2005. It is a voluntary program that allows local districts and exclusive representatives of the teachers to design and collectively bargain a plan that meets the five components of the law. The five components under Q Comp include: Career Ladder/Advancement Options, Job-embedded Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, Performance Pay, and an Alternative Salary Schedule.

Minnesota believes that effective teachers, with strong instructional practices can improve student achievement. The Q Comp program is a professional development model that promotes the restructuring of school systems by utilizing teacher leaders and providing teachers with time to meet in collegial teams to discuss instructional practices, student achievement data, and student work. The collaborative work of the teachers is to set goals for school-wide and individual student achievement, to improve instructional practices, and work with teacher instructional leaders to improve student achievement. The program includes a peer evaluation process for every teacher that is based on skills, responsibilities and student academic improvement. Teachers are rewarded and paid based on their performance, not just seniority.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:
(1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
(2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
(3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	51,155
Applied to transfer	427
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	320

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	No
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 251,790
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	61
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about public school choice:

 a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.[3]

 b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

[3] Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	16,430
Applied for supplemental educational services	2,537
Received supplemental educational services	1,874
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 3,451,079
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught <u>by</u> teachers who are highly qualified <u>and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified</u> will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	93,224	91,006	97.6	2,218	2.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	9,393	9,103	96.9	290	3.1
Low-poverty schools	8,239	8,091	98.2	148	1.8
All elementary schools	32,767	32,114	98.0	653	2.0
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	10,352	9,753	94.2	599	5.8
Low-poverty schools	20,329	20,032	98.5	297	1.5
All secondary schools	60,457	58,892	97.4	1,565	2.6
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Because of the way data are collected, Minnesota uses a hybrid method. Since we have no classroom level student data, we must use teacher data and the teacher data are collected in the form of assignments, which can cover more than one class, but not more than one subject. For example, a teacher may teach two classes of Algebra I and have one assignment for Algebra I. Alternately, the same teacher could instead be reported with a separate assignment for each "section" of Algebra I taught.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core*
academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*

c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*

g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are <u>not highly qualified</u>, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided <u>at each grade level</u> are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes <u>at a particular grade</u> level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically <u>for each grade</u> level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are <u>not</u> highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	23.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	53.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	23.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	11.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	36.8
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	51.3
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	52.7	22.3
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch program.	
Secondary schools	59.7	20.8
Poverty metric used	Percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch program.	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*

b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in** http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html.
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish. Hmong, French
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish, Hmong
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Co-teaching/collaborative models. Bilingual education assistant support. ELL In-class paraprofessional support Newcomer program Pull-out Push-in ELL SIOP

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	68,745
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the underlined number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	59,921
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	24,940
Hmong	16,052
Somali	8,310
Vietnamese	1,810
Russian	1,283

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000

characters.

Creolized English 1,054 Khmer 1,053 Lao 943 Arabic 874 Aromo 834

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	38,459
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	24,582
Total	63,041
Comments: In order to be counted as "tested" LEP students need to have gotten a valid score on all three of Minnesota's LEP assessments during the same year. LEP students who did not get a valid score on all three LEP assessments in the same year were considered "not tested".	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	2,588
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	4.1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	36,700
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	23,095
Total	59,795
Comments: MN counts as assessed LEP students in Title III schools who have valid scores on all three ELL tests. Students who do not have valid scores on all three ELL tests are not counted as tested.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and**
   submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.

2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and**
   percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	40,092	77.3
ELP attainment	2,502	10.6
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
NA
Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
NA
Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
NA
Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
3,954	4,179	8,133
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,428	2,257	65.8	1,171
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,119	2,556	81.9	563
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,586	441	27.8	1,145
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	91
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	24
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	77
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	70
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	12
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	29
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	42
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	7
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met all three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
15,985	2,287	5

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,005
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	521

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the**
   professional development (PD) activities reported.

4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	85	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	74	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	67	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	57	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	60	
Other (Explain in comment box)	18	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	79	6,623
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	79	1,233
PD provided to principals	66	445
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	49	258
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	50	1,190
PD provided to community based organization personnel	16	257
Total	339	10,006

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
7/1/07	7/1/07	35
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is

limited to 8,000 characters.

Minnesota has worked hard to shorten the distribution time span. The ESEA Consolidated Applications were due end of June and some applications were reviewed and approved as soon as possible and funds were made available immediately. By September 12 all districts had access to the funds.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	91.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	73.2
Hispanic	70.3
White, non-Hispanic	94.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	84.7
Limited English proficient	65.1
Economically disadvantaged	82.2
Migratory students	52.1
Male	89.6
Female	92.4
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

a.   *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2,*
2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

b.   *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	8.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	29.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	10.8
Black, non-Hispanic	26.8
Hispanic	29.8
White, non-Hispanic	5.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15.3
Limited English proficient	34.9
Economically disadvantaged	17.8
Migratory students	6.4
Male	10.2
Female	7.4
Comments: Improved data collection and business rules account for the difference.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	443	109
LEAs with subgrants	7	6
Total	450	115
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	59	245
K	231	485
1	233	394
2	202	410
3	194	370
4	215	331
5	248	339
6	270	313
7	229	299
8	229	323
9	243	352
10	261	344
11	288	330
12	308	418
Ungraded	0	
Total	3,210	4,953
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,277	3,388
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,487	1,265
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	70	86
Hotels/Motels	380	214
Total	3,214	4,953
Comments: Based on district survey results.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	846
K	472
1	530
2	525
3	477
4	450
5	447
6	420
7	415
8	413
9	472
10	458
11	444
12	577
Ungraded	N<!)
Total	6,950
Comments: zoomerang survey	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	305
Migratory children/youth	23
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,121
Limited English proficient students	395
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	7
Expedited evaluations	6
Staff professional development and awareness	7
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	7
Transportation	6
Early childhood programs	6
Assistance with participation in school programs	6
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	6
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	6
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	6
Coordination between schools and agencies	7
Counseling	5
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	5
Clothing to meet a school requirement	6
School supplies	6
Referral to other programs and services	6
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	5
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	2
School Selection	1
Transportation	3
School records	1
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	3
Other Barriers – in comment box below	3

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Families reluctant to provide information about homelessness.

Housing such as hotels unwilling to identify homeless students.

Inadequate clothes to wear.

School rules about start time and class time.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	193	76
4	173	64
5	154	63
6	153	54
7	146	41
8	119	26
High School	94	26
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	192	78
4	173	50
5	155	40
6	156	36
7	146	25
8	120	20
High School	93	N<10
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-ofschool youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do <u>not</u> include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	614
K	217
1	249
2	228
3	222
4	207
5	205
6	198
7	181
8	148
9	171
10	166
11	141
12	89
Ungraded	47
Out-of-school	35
Total	3,118
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Minnesota Department of Education has implemented better Quality Control and increased the amount of training for recruiters statewide. Another factor that seemed to decrease our numbers were the Immigration, Customs and Enforcement (ICE) raids on some of Minnesota's meat processing plants. One of these in particular was well published nationally and had a chilling effect on our recruitment efforts. While our numbers decreased we feel this is a more accurate reflection of the current migrant population in Minnesota.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the underlined statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs

- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	448
K	118
1	124
2	119
3	112
4	119
5	101
6	100
7	97
8	60
9	99
10	77
11	80
12	35
Ungraded	17
Out-of-school	12
Total	1,718
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This summer we focused on strengthening the communication and partnerships between our family service workers who recruit on-site at summer programs and in surrounding areas of the programs and our regional recruiters who encompass a larger regional area. Through weekly conference calls, they were able to share trends and areas that they felt needed assistance. This collaboration improved our recruitment efforts. We believe that the increase to the Category 2 count is a direct result of better coordination and more trainings of our recruiters in the identification and recruitment efforts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

What system did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and 2 child count? Minnesota began using the MIS2000 system in January 2000.

Were the child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system? Yes, Minnesota used the MIS2000 system last year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?
Minnesota Identification & Recruitment process worked cooperatively with Tri-Valley Opportunity Council (TVOC) to recruit potential eligible
migrant children ages 6 weeks to age 21 with oversight by Midwest Migrant Educational Resource Center (MMERC). This joint recruitment process allowed TVOC, a Head Start program serving children ages 6 weeks to 5 years old or until they enter Kindergarten and the Title I Migrant Education Program to directly serve students PreK-21.

What data were collected?
The following COE data elements were collected: student information (family surnames): birth date, age, gender, race; parent or guardian

(s) legal names, current residence, home base residence, all children's names, relationship to parent or guardian, current grade and school, qualifying activity, qualifying activity date and residence date.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?
The local and regional outreach workers conducted personal interviews in the following locations: homes, schools, businesses, labor camp, processing plants, in the fields and farms with potential eligible migrant families to determine eligibility using an original, triplicate paper copy of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Once eligibility was determined the parent/guardian and the recruiter both signed the COE for eligibility verification.

School Year Process-the local Recruiter/school liaison gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. We also had several regional recruiters that identified migrant students in unfunded districts and did outreach to agricultural businesses. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputted the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered. The Quality Control specialist reviews the reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy.

Summer Process-the regional Statewide Recruiter (Family Service Worker (FSW)/Local Recruiters) gathered information from migrant families through a personal interview process to determine eligibility. The information was reviewed and approved by the local supervisor and then forwarded to the ID & R Manager at TVOC and then forwarded to the data entry clerk who inputteds the data into MIS2000 system. TVOC runs reports to cross check the data that has been entered and forwards it the Quality Control specialist to review reports on the MIS2000 system for accuracy. .

When were the data collected for use in the student information system?
The data was collected continuously and submitted regularly and entered into the MIS2000 database.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for

child count purposes at the State level The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to verify the count and before any of the tables are run, our MIS2000 data entry clerk ran a snap report of the MIS2000 database system called "Potential Duplicate Students". A list was generated that identified all students that had the same first and last name and same date of birth. The students were merged in the system to eliminate any duplication. A second report was run from the Potential Duplicate Student, but using different criteria. A request was made for the same first name OR last name AND same date of birth. This list is much longer. That was a check for any possible misspellings or obvious errors. We verified the COE to see if the students had the same family surname. Sometimes it was discovered that there were two COEs for the same family.

Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000).

Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to

ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who–in the case of Category 2–received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

1. students who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g. were between 3-21 years of age, were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
2. students who were residents in Minnesota for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/01-8/31);
3. students who in the case of category 2-received MEP funded services during the summer or intersession term; and
4. students once per child count category.

   - EnrollDate, FundingDate, QADate, ResDate, or WithdrawDate was between the StartDate and the EndDate entered (check for dates of activity that occur during the date range.)
   - FacilityID was between MN and MO (count only enrollments in MN schools
   - Birthdate was after the StartDate minus 22 years (The child turns 22 after StartDate.)
   - Birthdate was before the EndDate minus 3 years (The child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
   - 22nd Birhtday was after the FundingDate (the child turns 22 after the FundingDate.)
   - 3rd Birthday was before the WithdrawDate, or the WithdrawDate is null (The child turns 3 before the WithdrawDate or there is no Withdrawdate entered.)
   - LQMDate plus 3 years was after the StartDate (LQMDate is within 3 years of the StartDate.)

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All recruiters were required to attend trainings throughout the year that discuss eligibility requirements, accurate completion of the Certificate of Eligibility, receive updates on new regulations or systems like MSIX, train on interviewing skills, hands on exercises with scenarios, agri-businesses connections, and communicate and share ideas with peers. Each training has a pre and post test component to ensure that recruiters have understood the concepts.

Does MN provide recruiters with written eligiblity guidance (e.g., a handbook)? Yes, recruiters receive the MN Identification and Recruitment manual, plus all recruiters receive a copy of OME Non-Regulatory Guidance.

Weekly conference calls are held throughout the year to update regional recruiters and summer recruiters on eligibility information and to share pertinent recruiting information with others.

The recruiter conducted a personal interview to gather migrant eligibility information on the COE, once eligibility was determined and COE was completed then both the parents and the recruiter verified the data by signing the hard triplicate COE.

Each COE is then reviewed by the TVOC ID&R manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file.

Does MN periodically evaluate the effectiveness of recruitments efforts and revise procedures? Yes, recruitment procedures have been evaluated and adjusted to increase the effectiveness of recruitment efforts. This past year defining the recruitment regions, working with school district staff at funded districts and working closely with MARRS coordinators and state MARRS coordinator have increased the effectiveness of recruitment efforts in Minnesota.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

58 students were randomly selected for re-interview process. Some of the families were contacted via phone or home visit. In cases where a second interview was not attainable (no phone available); other supporting documents were sought. NGS (Texas Migrant Database), MN school district enrollment records and Migrant Head Start supporting documents were viewed to further determine eligibility. Of the 58 students in the study two were found ineligible; one due to not residing in MN (family lived in North Dakota) and one due to length of residency in MN (end of eligibility expired in 2006). 56 students were found eligible.

Was your re-interviewing sample done statewide overall or was it stratified by group/area? The re-interviewing sample was done statewide.

Were re-interviewers trained and provided guidance? Yes, re-interviewing was done by

Were re-interviewers independent from original interviewers? Yes.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and–for systems that merge data–consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Minnesota Migrant Education Program weekly ran the "Verify COE data" in the MIS2000 system, which the data entry clerk used to crosscheck the report to ensure that all the required data elements were entered accurately into the system. The data entry clerk sent the batch of COEs to the State Migrant Education Program for filing.

Reports of enrolled children are sent to district data clerks periodically throughout the year to cross check for accuracy of information in the State MARSS database and to ensure that only eligible children have been entered into the migrant database (MIS2000).

Current enrolled reports are run periodically and the Quality Control specialist compares those numbers to district and recruiters reports to ensure all data has been entered accurately and to monitor counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the SEA was to upload changes, verify and back up data to ensure that the most accurate data was reported to the Office of Migrant Education. The above mentioned checks were programmed in the MIS2000 system to report only requested reporting elements.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP

eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA will be utilizing the Student Linking System to verify that LEAs are only reporting eligible migrant students. This will allow the MEP to ensure correct data entry

Each COE is reviewed by the TVOC ID&R manager to ensure that eligibility requirements are met and that it is filled out accurately. If the manager discovers that a family is not eligible, the specific recruiter, ID&R oversight coordinator and state department are notified. The ineligible students are taken out of MIS2000 and kept in a separate file.

If any students are found ineligible during our annual state re-interviewing process, these students will be removed from MIS2000. Results of the re-interview are shared with oversight coordinator, the state department and local districts and recruiters. Districts/recruiters having an ineligible student will be contacted to determine the best way to correct the discrepancy.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.